

REMARKS

Claims 1, 4-17, 19, 20, 22, 24, 25, 27, 29, 30, 33-39, and 40-44 are pending after this amendment.

Applicant has amended claims 1, 4, 9, 10, 15, 20, 22, 24, 25, and 27 in order to more particularly define the invention. The amendments were not necessitated by the claim rejections. Applicant makes no admission as to the patentability or unpatentability of the originally filed claims.

Claims 46-48 have been added. Claims 2, 3, 18, 21, 23, 26, 28, 31, 32, and 45 have been canceled.

The amendments and remarks presented herein are in response to the Office Action dated July 28, 2006.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-7, 9-10, 14-16, 19-22, 23, 27, 28, 30-36, 38, and 41-43 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Fisher. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1, which has been amended merely to more particularly point out the subject matter of the invention, now recites:

“A multi-projector display system for displaying an image including at least one window, comprising:
a window projector, for displaying, at a display location, a portion of the image corresponding to a movable window;
a workspace projector, for displaying the remainder of the image;
an input device, for receiving user input; and

a control mechanism, coupled to the window projector, for, responsive to the input device receiving a user command to drag the window from one location to another, changing the display location of the window portion of the image.”

The display system of the claimed invention includes two projectors that together display an image including a window. A window projector displays a portion of the image corresponding to the window. A workspace projector displays the remainder of the image. The system responds to user input, including user commands to drag the window from one location to another. In response to such a drag command, a control mechanism changes the display location of the window portion of the image. As described in the specification, such a scheme is particularly useful in environments where a large image is being displayed in one format or resolution and it is desirable to present a window in a different format or resolution within the image.

Fisher fails to teach or suggest the claimed limitations. Fisher merely describes systems for generating and displaying images for simulation systems that incorporate a movable viewing platform. An area of interest is enveloped by a wide field background. The inset area can move to accommodate simulator movements by coordination with the viewing platform. The screen is substantially filled by three background color components red, blue, and green, except that the inset area receives only background projections of the component images in blue and red. Separate green, red, and blue cathode ray tube (CRT)

projectors generate the background component images. The green CRT projector projects a narrower high resolution green color component to fill the inset area.

Fisher is directed toward a completely different problem and context than the claimed invention. Specifically, Fisher is intended to provide an area of interest for a simulation system and therefore does not disclose any technique whereby a user can drag a window from one location to another to effect a change in the window portion of an image in the manner claimed. Although Fisher describes moving the inset area, there is no hint or suggestion of performing such movement responsive to a user command to drag a window from one location to another. Rather, Fisher describes moving its inset area to accommodate simulator movements by coordination with the viewing platform.

Accordingly, claim 1 is respectfully submitted to be patentable over the cited reference.

Claims 5-7, 10-11, 14-16, and 19 depend from claim 1 and incorporate all of the limitations of claim 1 as amended, including those limitations discussed above. Accordingly, for at least the reasons discussed above, these claims are respectfully submitted to be patentable over the cited reference.

Claims 22, 27-28 recite limitations similar to those discussed above in connection with claim 1. Accordingly, for at least the reasons discussed above, these claims are respectfully submitted to be patentable over the cited reference.

Claims 30, 34-36, and 41-43 are method claims that recite limitations similar to those discussed above in connection with claim 1. Accordingly, for at least the reasons discussed above, these claims are respectfully submitted to be patentable over the cited reference.

Claims 2-3, 23, 28, and 31-32 have been canceled.

Claim 4, which has been amended merely to more particularly point out the subject matter of the invention, now recites:

“A multi-projector display system for displaying an image including at least one window, comprising:
a window projector, for displaying, at a first display location, a portion of the image corresponding to a first window;
a workspace projector, for displaying the remainder of the image outside the first window;
an input device, for receiving user input indicating a focus change from the first window to a second window, the second window having at least one of a position different from the position of the first window and a size different from the size of the first window; and
a control mechanism, coupled to the window projector, for causing the window projector to display, at a second display location, a portion of the image corresponding to the second window and causing the workspace projector to display the remainder of the image outside the second window.”

Claim 4 recites a multi-projector display system that reacts to a focus change from a first window to a second window, where both windows are part of an overall image. A window projector displays a portion of the image corresponding to the window currently in focus; a workspace project displays the remainder of the image. An input device receives user input indicating a

focus change (for example, when the user clicks on a second window to activate it). The second window has a position and/or size different from those of the first window. A control mechanism causes the window projector to display the portion of the image corresponding to the second window and causes the workspace projector to display the remainder of the image. In this manner, the system of the claimed invention is able to present a particular portion of the image (the window that currently has focus) with a window projector, and is further able to react to user input indicating a change in focus.

Nowhere in Fisher is any such technique described. The Examiner stated that col. 5, lines 5-8 describe actuating a window which the Examiner stated is the same as activating a window. However, the cited portion of Fisher does not provide any disclosure related to the claimed subject matter. Rather, col. 5, lines 5-8 describe an example where the operator actuates the controls to revolve the cockpit to the right, so as to cause the area of interest to shift to the right. There controls are activated; there is no mention of any technique for activating a window other than the window (or area of interest) that currently has focus. In fact, Fisher does not provide any technique for presenting more than one window (or area of interest) or for changing focus from one such window to another, whether by activation (or actuation) of a window or by other means. A careful reading of Fisher reveals that it teaches movement of an area of interest but does not teach a shift in focus from one area of interest to another. Since

there is no mention of two or more windows or areas of interest, it would not make sense in the context of Fisher to respond to a focus change from one window to a second window.

Accordingly, claim 4 is respectfully submitted to be patentable over the cited reference.

Claim 33 is a method claim that recites limitations similar to those discussed above in connection with claim 4. Accordingly, for at least the reasons discussed above, this claim is respectfully submitted to be patentable over the cited reference.

Claim 9, which has been amended merely to more particularly point out the subject matter of the invention, now recites:

A multi-projector display system for displaying an image including at least one window, comprising:
a window projector, for displaying, at a display location, a portion of the image corresponding to a movable window, the portion comprising a motion picture;
a workspace projector, for displaying the remainder of the image, the remainder comprising a still image; and
a control mechanism, coupled to the window projector, for changing at least one of the display location and the size of the window portion of the image.

The claimed invention is a multi-projector display system for displaying an image. A window projector displays a portion of the image corresponding to a movable window; this portion comprises a motion picture. A workspace

projector displays the remainder of the image, which comprises a still image. A control mechanism is adapted to change the location and/or size of the window portion of the image.

The claimed invention thus provides a mechanism for displaying an image that has moving and still components, and for changing the location and/or size of the moving component. The invention operates in a context where multiple projectors are used.

Fisher fails to provide any description of such a system. In particular, Fisher does not teach any system where a portion of the image comprises a motion picture and the remainder of the image comprises a still image. The Examiner cites col. 1, lines 18-19 as teaching such a system. However, contrary to the Examiner's assertion this cited portion merely mentions that simulation display systems must be capable of providing dynamic or moving images, and in particular fails to teach the limitations claimed herein.

Claim 38 is a method claim that recites limitations similar to those discussed above in connection with claim 9. Accordingly, for at least the reasons discussed above, this claim is respectfully submitted to be patentable over the cited reference.

The Examiner rejected claims 8, 11-13, 20-21, 25-26, 29, 37, 39, and 40 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fisher in view of Lechner. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 8 depends from claim 7, which incorporates the limitations discussed above in connection with amended claim 1. Claims 11-13 depend from claim 1, and thereby also incorporate the limitations discussed above in connection with amended claim 1. Claim 37 depends from claim 36, which incorporates the limitations from amended claim 30 and discussed above in connection with amended claim 1. Claims 39-40 depend from claim 30, and thereby also incorporate the limitations discussed above in connection with amended claim 1. Claims 20, 25, and 29 now recite similar limitations relating to changing a display location for a window portion responsive to a user command to drag a window from one location to another. As discussed above, Fisher fails to describe any technique or system that responds to user commands in such a manner.

Lechner fails to address this deficiency. Lechner merely describes techniques for generating inset images having smaller size and higher resolution than a background image. However, no mechanism for changing a display location for a window portion responsive to a user command is described. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 8, 11-13, 20, 25, 29, 37,

39, and 40 are patentably distinct from the cited references, taken alone or in any combination.

Claims 21 and 26 have been canceled.

The Examiner rejected claims 17, 18, 44, and 45 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fisher in view of Dugdale. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 17 depends from claim 1, and incorporates the limitations discussed above in connection with amended claim 1. Claim 44 depends from claim 30, and incorporates the limitations from amended claim 30 and discussed above in connection with amended claim 1. As discussed above, Fisher fails to describe any technique or system for changing a display location for a window portion responsive to a user command to drag a window from one location to another.

Dugdale fails to address this deficiency. Dugdale merely describes an alignable image projector system for projecting slewable visual images. Dugdale includes a lens system that performs zoom and focus functions to cause a target image to appear at a proper size (col. 3, lines 8-10). Mirror 60 is slewable to move the target image. However, there is no hint or suggestion of any mechanism for changing a display location for a window portion responsive to a user command to drag a window from one location to another. Accordingly, Applicants

respectfully submit that claims 17 and 44 are patentably distinct from the cited references, taken alone or in any combination.

Claims 18 and 45 have been canceled.

The Examiner rejected claim 24 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fisher in view of Fisher 2. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 24 depends from claim 22, which incorporates the limitations discussed above. As discussed above, Fisher fails to describe any technique or system for changing a display location for a window portion responsive to a user command to drag a window from one location to another.

Fisher 2 fails to address this deficiency. Fisher 2 merely describes techniques for visually blending an area of interest with a background image by varying the border between the two areas in an orbital oscillation pattern. However, there is no hint or suggestion of any mechanism for changing a display location for a window portion responsive to a user command to drag a window from one location to another. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 22 is patentably distinct from the cited references, taken alone or in any combination.

New claims 46-48 have been added to further point out the nature of the invention. Specifically, these claims recite changing the size of the window portion of the image responsive to user input indicating a user command to resize the window. None of the cited references discloses such a technique.

Support for the amendments and for the new claims appears, for example, at paragraphs 0034, 0046-0050, 0053-0054, and Fig. 7 of the originally filed specification. No new matter has been added.

In view of the above remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the invention claimed herein is patentably distinct from the cited references, taken alone or in any combination.

Accordingly, consideration of this application and the early allowance of all claims herein are requested.

Should the Examiner wish to discuss the above amendments and remarks, or if the Examiner believes that for any reason direct contact with Applicants' representative would help to advance the prosecution of this case to finality, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,
John Barrus, Kurt Piersol and Stephen
Savitzky

Dated: November 28, 2006

By: /Amir H. Raubvogel/
Amir H. Raubvogel, Reg. No.: 37,070
Fenwick & West LLP

Silicon Valley Center
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA 94041
Tel.: (650) 335-7276
Fax: (650) 938-5200